

R E M A R K S

Claims 25-54 are in the application.

Original claims 1-24 have, for convenience, been cancelled and replaced by claims 25-54. Original independent claims 1 and 12 have been replaced by independent claims 25 and 39, respectively, which have been modified and rewritten to overcome informalities that had been addressed in the parent application (S.N. 08/813,744, now allowed) and to clearly distinguish over the references cited in the parent application. Original dependent claims 2-11 and 13-24 have been revised to conform to the new independent claims and are, accordingly, replaced by the new dependent claims 26-38 and 40-54.

Six claims in addition to those already paid for, are now pending in the application. Authorization is granted to charge the excess claim fee of \$108.00 to deposit account 19-3790. A separate fee authorization letter is enclosed.

The Specification on page 1 has been amended by deleting the paragraph spanning lines 25-31. This paragraph is a duplicate of page 1, lines 18-24.

The Specification on page 12, line 24 has been amended to indicate that the Bit# ranges from 1 to (B - 1). This amendment, which was entered in the parent application, is not new matter since it is a formalization of the description on page 12, lines 9-17.

The amendment to Specification page 12, line 33, which was entered in the parent application, is not new matter since it simply exemplifies the corrected equation on page 12, line 29.

In the parent application, the Examiner cited the Cole et al. patent 5,752,042 in view of the Platt patent 5,421,009. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 25-54 presented above are clearly patentably distinct from these cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention, as recited in new independent claim 25, addresses a problem and provides a solution that is completely absent

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

from the Cole et al. and Platt patents. As explained in Applicants' Specification, the present invention eliminates the problems associated with upgrade, release and installation of the separate software program entities of a computer system, such as the Operating System and Special Purpose Processor microcode, when a new feature is introduced that requires the mutual support of the separate software program entities. When these software program entities are independently upgraded and installed, the computer system may malfunction if the new feature is invoked, but an upgraded version of a software program entity required for mutual support of the feature is not installed. Cole et al., on the other hand, discloses a server that, by the use of recognizer programs, determines the basic system information of the client and characteristics of the client's files to determine appropriate updates for the client. The client selects the desired updates and downloads them from a content server. Platt provides an error message when a server is prevented from downloading software programs to a remote client computer for a variety of reasons such as that the client cannot be reached through the network.

New independent claim 25 has been extensively revised to definitize the environment for which the feature exchange method of the present invention is intended and to include limitations that are believed to distinguish over the combination of references. Specifically, the preamble of claim 25 recites the computer system having features that require mutual support of at least two of the software program entities in order that the features operate properly. The claim recites that the computer system is subject to introduction of new features and the software program entities are subject to new releases to support the new features. The last paragraph of claim 25 recites that improper operation of the computer system is prevented that is due to installation of a release of a software program entity that supports a feature requiring mutual support of another software program entity where the release of the other

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

software program entity supporting the feature has not been installed. Applicants respectfully submit that this problem and a solution for the problem are neither disclosed nor implied by Cole et al. and Platt.

With respect to the elements of claim 25, Applicants respectfully submit that Cole et al. and Platt do not disclose or imply storing, associated with each of a first and second software program entity, first and second indications, respectively, of features supported by the software program entity that require mutual support of the other software program entity in order that the features operate properly, all as recited in the claim. Additionally, the mutual comparison of the first and second indications in the comparing step of claim 25 is also neither disclosed nor implied by the references. Furthermore, claim 25 recites taking an appropriate action if either the first indications include an indication of a feature not included in the second indications or the second indications include an indication of a feature not included in the first indications. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Cole et al. nor Platt, taken either singly or in combination, disclose or imply these specific recitations.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that a reasonable combination of Cole et al. in view of Platt does not result in a system that anticipates or renders obvious the present invention as recited in claim 25. In Applicants' parent application, Platt was cited to introduce the error message of Platt into the system of Cole et al. The error message of Platt is generated when the server is unable to communicate properly with a remote client. A reasonable combination of Cole et al. and Platt would result in the system of Cole et al. generating an error message if the Cole et al. server could not communicate properly with the Cole et al. client. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 25 is predicated on communication between the first and second software program entities so as to be able to exchange the first and second sets of feature

indications therebetween. The appropriate action, or error action, is taken when one of the software program entities has a feature that requires mutual support of the other software program entity but the feature indications of the other software program entity does not include this feature. This is entirely different from the combined Cole et al. and Platt system where the error message involves a lack of proper communication.

New claim 26, which depends from claim 25, recites details of the specific mutual transfers and comparisons of the first and second indications which are believed to further distinguish the present invention from these references.

The remarks given above with respect to independent claim 25 are also applicable to independent counterpart claim 39.

The remaining dependent method and apparatus claims derive patentability from the independent claims, as discussed above, and recite numerous elements that further distinguish the present invention from Cole et al. and Platt.

Respectfully submitted,



Albert B. Cooper
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 25,720
Telephone No. (212) 249-4435

BEST AVAILABLE COPY